

Remarks

This Amendment is submitted in response to the office action dated April 3, 2002. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested. In this office action at paragraph one, prosecution was reopened. Applicant therefore exercises the option 1 of filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111.

The Examiner states that the oath or declaration is defective; therefore, **the requested declarations are attached to this response.**

At paragraph 3, the Examiner objects to the drawings. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Pairs of axially directed wires appear clearly in Figure 8A; and the adjacent wires carrying current in opposite directions appears clearly in Figures 8A and 8B.

At paragraph 5, claims 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 as being indefinite because of what the Examiner claims is a lack of clear antecedent basis for the claim recitations. Therefore, the Applicant has edited the claims to eliminate this issue.

The Examiner rejects 6 through 9 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as anticipated by Tsukuda et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is a magnetizer for magnetizing a magnet (50). The magnet is circular having a plurality of alternating north/south poles and a null transition zone disposed between each alternating pole. The magnetizer generates the alternating north/south poles and null transitions zones there between.

In particular, the magnetizer comprises a back iron (54) circumscribing a circular insulative inner core (52). The magnet (50) is disposed between the inner circumference of the back iron (54) and outer circumference of the inner core (52). In one embodiment, a gap (159) is formed between the outer circumference of the magnet (50) and the inner circumference of the back iron (54).

A plurality of wire pairs (56, 58) are axially disposed through the circular insulative inner core (52), where each wire pair are located close together. Figure 8A depicts a top-plan, cross-sectional view of the magnetizer, where one illustrative pair of

Serial No.: 09/631,438

wires identified with an "x" show the current flow into the drawing page, while, the pair of wires identified with a "." (i.e., "dot") show the current flow out of the drawing page. When current flows through the paired wires, flux fields (57, 59) are created around each pair of wires (56, 58). The flux fields generated by the paired wires establishes a magnetic field between the inner core (52) and the back iron (54) to magnetize the magnet (50). The null transition zones are formed in the regions between the paired wires (56, 58) where there is no flux field from the paired wires passing through the magnet (50).

The apparatus cited by the Examiner simply does not show the structure described and claimed in any of the claims. The structure shown in Figure 6 of the reference provides active magnetizing members on both sides of the magnet to be magnetized. Contrary to claim 6, it does not use a back iron to shape the magnetic flux to form null regions. It does not use pairs of wire to create the flux field in the manner disclosed and claimed herein. Contrary to claim 7, it does not show a gap where the gap remains open when the magnet is inserted; rather, the magnetizing devices are clearly pressed tight the sides of the magnet. Therefore, claims 6 and 7 are clearly patentable. Claim 8 is means plus function claim which is interpreted to read on Figures 8A and 8B whereby a flux path is created to run through the magnet to the back iron, through the back iron and return from the back iron to establish the null zones in the magnet. Clearly, this reads on the magnetizer shown in Figures 8A and 8B, and cannot said to be shown by the reference cited by the Examiner for the very reasons stated above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of this claim and its dependent claim is also requested.

The Examiner has maintained his rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Soeda et al., taken with Littwin. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Applicant went to great length in his appeal brief to distinguish and did successfully distinguish the claims from the Soeda patent. The Examiner has not answered in any way the issues raised by the Applicant in distinguishing the claimed

Serial No.: 09/631,438

PATENT

Attorney Docket No. A-59709-3/JAS
Client Ref. SEA 2294.2

invention from Soeda. Therefore, the Applicant stands on that argument and requests consideration thereof which does not appear in the present office action.

Finally, Applicant submits a new claim 10 which is clearly patentable for all the above described reasons.

In view of these many clear distinctions, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

If any matters can be handled by telephone, Applicant requests that the Examiner telephone Applicant's attorney at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 20-0782 (Order No. A-59709-3/80322942JAS).

Respectfully submitted,

By: James A. Sheridan
James A. Sheridan, Reg. No. 25,435

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
350 Cambridge Avenue, Suite 250
Palo Alto, California 94306
Telephone: (650) 330-2310
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314